

New Frontier

MUGGINGS REACH EPIDEMIC
LEVEL (Page 3)



JANUARY 1982

12p

VOICE OF THE **NEW** NATIONAL FRONT

GLUM PROSPECT 1982

**BRITAIN FACES ANOTHER YEAR
OF MISERY AND CHAOS UNDER
THE OLD-GANG POLITICIANS
AND PARTIES**

**INFLATION
MORE OUT OF WORK
ANARCHY • RACE RIOTS
RISING CRIME • TERRORISM**

AS BRITAIN enters 1982, the prospect is that the new year will be even more miserable than the old. 1981 was a year of unmitigated national disaster on all fronts: unemployment rose to 3 million; inflation continued rampant; industry was paralysed by strikes; race riots ravaged our cities; crime continued to rise alarmingly; the IRA remained undefeated and its terror gangs took many more lives. There is no sign that in the year just beginning things will get any better; all the signs are that they will get worse.

Things will get worse because Britain has no leadership; it has only the squalid farce of the political party game, varied only fractionally by the entry into the field of the coalition of failed and rejected Labourites calling itself the 'Social Democratic Party'. The arrival of the SDP means simply that the old party game is now four-cornered instead of three-cornered, and that come election time an even bigger number of sparrows are fighting each other for the crumbs of office. In terms of men and ideas needed to raise Britain out of bankruptcy and chaos, nothing has changed; there is, as ever, a total void. The old order — or rather disorder — still prevails.

QUACK 'CURE'

This May, Mrs. Thatcher's Government will have been in power three years — time enough to produce some evidence that its policies will work. So far all the evidence is that they have not worked and cannot work. In the face of this evidence, Mrs. Thatcher's supporters have resorted to the oldest spoof in the repertoire of party politics. They try to divert our minds from the misery of the present by promises of good times to come in the future. An improvement in things is always "just round the

corner" — if only we will remain calm for a little longer, keep our belts tight and trust in the goodness of the Government and the system. Of course they were saying just the same thing at the beginning of last year and they will be saying just the same thing at the beginning of next year. They are like the peddlers of quack medicines who, when confronted with dissatisfied customers who have tried the cure and found it doesn't work, tell them they must be patient and wait a little longer — and in the meantime keep buying more bottles of the stuff so as to keep the quacks in business.

The basis of the Thatcher cure for the British economy is 'monetarism'. Keep British industry short of money and it will be compelled to streamline its methods of production in order to survive. The theory is that this will lead to greater efficiency and productivity and to Britain recapturing her share of the markets around the world. In practice it has merely led to thousands of British companies going bankrupt and thousands more about to do so, to increasing industrial war as workers face the prospect of indefinite unemployment, and to money that should be used for the regeneration of industry being diverted to keeping people on the dole.

What Britain needed at the end of the 1970s was an economic revolution that would transform her entire industrial and commercial life — a new road of economic development that would be neither socialist nor capitalist in the old sense, which would not be hide-bound by the outdated ideologies and practices of the old world but would be adapted to the facts of the new world of the late 20th and 21st centuries, a world that has not even started to dawn on the minds of the old party politicians. For such an economic revolution to be possible, a political revolution would have to take place first, because the economic changes needed in this country are com-

pletely outside the capability of the old parties and their system, with its built-in paralysis in all fields where dynamic reform, leadership and action are required. No national reconstruction, whether in the economy or anywhere else, is possible without a co-ordinated national effort to a common purpose. And this will not occur as long as the nation is torn apart by conflicting sectional interests, whether they be trade union power on the one hand or big business power on the other.

But to overcome the anarchy of sectional interests working one against another we need first a strength of national leadership that can only emerge through a revolutionary change in our political institutions and values.

The same paralysis of politicians and parties was shown in the reaction to the widespread rioting that took place in Britain's inner city areas during 1981. This challenge to law and order demanded the immediate exercise of an iron fist — first to put down the forces of violence and anarchy and ensure that those responsible would be deterred from ever trying the same thing again, then to set about removing the root causes of the trouble by the repatriation of the alien elements that had predominated almost everywhere among the rioting mobs.

JELLYFISH APPROACH

Neither of these things was done. Instead of an iron fist, we saw only the quivering and vacillating of that species of jellyfish which has become familiar throughout the established spectrum of politicians when confronted with a crisis. The rioters, instead of being severely punished, were appeased with fresh hand-outs of money from a government which seems to be short of money for every other national purpose. The onus of



**THE OLD GANG: THEY OFFER NOTHING BUT
WORN-OUT IDEAS AND SLOGANS**

Contd. on back page

New Frontier

No. 12 JANUARY 1982

Editor: Ronald Rickcord

Contributing Editor: Charles Parker

New Frontier, PO Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.
Tel: 0273 777540

SPREADING THE WORD

ACCORDING to Dr. David Owen, the way that broadcasting time is allocated to political parties during elections is a "carve up." We agree with Dr. Owen that the present system is unfair; but we do not remember his making any complaints about it before his defection from the Labour Party.

The present system was devised before the 1979 election. At that time the three main parties agreed among themselves that the amount of time allocated to each party would be dependent on the number of votes cast for them at the previous general election. This method suited them because it effectively restricted the time allotted to non-Establishment parties to a minimum, which was, as we know, one of the main objects of the exercise.

Unfortunately for Dr. Owen and his cronies, this system will also prevent the SDP from getting any broadcasting time at the next election since his party did not exist during the last one. He therefore complains that the system is "undemocratic" and proposes that broadcasting time should now be proportionately divided between parties according to the percentage of votes cast for them at by-elections held since the last general election. How convenient!

New Frontier has nothing but contempt for Dr. Owen's hypocritical gerrymandering. However, since the SDP is, if nothing else, a party of the Establishment, we think that the existing rules will be conveniently bent so that the new party can have a bite at the cherry. In any case, who would dare to stop such steadfast people of principle as Roy Jenkins, Shirley 'Grunwick' Williams and Dr. Owen from airing their views?

Skulduggery of this sort merely confirms our belief that parliamentary democracy is a hollow sham, and that in the past we may have been mistaken in devoting so much time and effort in futile electioneering. But that is no excuse for giving up the struggle. Far from it: instead we should be looking for even better ways to publicise our views.

Fortunately, one way of spreading the word is already available to us. We refer to video technology. Our enemies may make it difficult for our supporters and the uncommitted to attend our functions or obtain our publications, and they may deny us time on TV and radio; but the home video revolution is going to make it impossible for them to prevent us capturing the hearts and minds of large numbers of our fellow countrymen.

This is an opportunity we must not let slip. Our young men and women with the necessary aptitude have a duty to learn and master the new techniques so that our Nationalist beliefs can be projected nationwide. The survival of our Race and Nation may depend on how well they perform that task.

THE HOME OFFICE has announced that 14,700 immigrants were allowed to settle in Britain during the third quarter of 1981. This brings the total number of immigrants settled in Britain during the nine months ending on September the 30th to 46,150. The Home Office does not provide estimates about the number of illegal immigrants entering the country.

★★★★

ISRAELI Trade Minister Gideon Patt has announced that Israel will impose restrictions on imported goods to protect Israeli-manufactured goods from unfair competition from foreign manufacturers.

★★★★

A 42-year-old Pakistani shopkeeper, Mohmeed Yasin of Beanhill, Bucks, has been fined £175 for sexually assaulting a 12-year-old girl who went to his shop, to buy crisps. The presiding magistrate told Yasin that the members of the bench were "absolutely disgusted" by his behaviour. Speaking on Yasin's behalf, Mr. Abdul Malik of the Luton Community Relations Council said that Yasin "is one of the most decent persons in the Pakistani community."

★★★★

THE WORLD BANK has announced that although Russia's gross national product is about half that of the United States and roughly the same

as those of the United Kingdom and West Germany combined, Russia spends between 12 and 15 per cent of her GNP on armaments whereas the United States spend only 3 per cent and the U.K. 5 per cent.

★★★★

NEWS ROUND-UP


A HOUSE OF LORDS' ruling has forced Hillingdon Borough Council to house a Bangladeshi immigrant and his wife and four children whom he recently brought to Britain. The ruling stipulates that the immigrant, Mr. Taffazul Islam, must be housed as a matter of priority. Mr. John Watts, leader of Hillingdon Council, said: "The real losers in this judgment are the 1,900 local families on our waiting list and our ratepayers who face having to fork out £300,000 this year alone for temporary accommodation."

★★★★

NINE members of the Socialist Workers' Party, including a college lecturer, who went to Rochdale armed with "a fearsome array of weapons" to attack right-wing opponents, have been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment for forcing a 16-year-old skinhead to give them the names and addresses

ESTABLISHMENT RIDDLED WITH TRAITORS

NEW FACTS REVEALED BUT NO ACTION IS TAKEN



Anthony Blunt

IN AN ARTICLE that appeared in last May's *New Frontier* we deplored the activities of the traitors in Britain who are apparently permitted to continue enjoying the fruits of treason with impunity. We urged the Government to hold an inquiry into the activities of the Soviet spy network that has been operating in our country for many years, and we demanded that a mandatory death sentence be passed on anyone con-

victed of treason. In addition we predicted that the unmasking of the traitor Anthony Blunt would lead to further revelations about spies who have managed to insinuate themselves into sensitive and lucrative positions in the Establishment. We wrote: "*New Frontier* believes that these revelations are but the tip of a very large iceberg. The rot must be fully exposed."



Leo Long

TIP OF THE ICEBERG

Events since those words were written are confirming our prediction that the Blunt Affair was the tip of an iceberg, but the Government has done nothing to expose the rot. On the contrary, the Government seems to be doing all that it can to shield the traitors

from prosecution and excuse their treachery; and the recent unmasking of two more Cambridge traitors, Leo Long and Edward Scott, was not brought about by any action of the Government or Security Services.

The perfidy of Long, a former Intelligence Officer, and Scott, a retired diplomat, came to light as a result of disclosures made in Mr. Nigel West's recent book, *M15: British Security Service Operations, 1909-1945*. More disturbing is Mr. West's promise that he will reveal

Contd. on back page

How Britain treats war widows

CONSIDER the case of 78-year-old Mrs. Frances Willis who lives in Northampton. Mrs. Willis is deaf and has cancer of the throat. She is also a war widow. In fact, to use her own words, she is a "second generation war widow" because her mother was made a war widow during World War I. Mrs. Willis lost her husband when he was serving in the Royal Air Force during World War II.

But Mrs. Willis is a courageous and indefatigable old lady. For many years, almost single handed, she has been fighting a campaign to improve the financial lot of war widows and pensioners, who have been shamefully treated over the years by successive British Governments. Mrs. Willis points out that war pensioners in other countries, including Germany and Japan, fare very much better than their counterparts in Britain. She also accuses organisations like the British Legion and the Royal Air Force Benevolent Fund of doing far too little for war pensioners.

Despite her age and infirmities, Mrs. Willis believes in taking direct action when necessary. Not long

ago she tore up a wreath laid on the tomb of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey by the Japanese Ambassador. She did it because she felt that a Japanese wreath on the tomb was an insult to the memory of the thousands of Britons who died in the Japanese slave camps during the last war. Mrs. Willis was arrested but no charges were preferred against her on this occasion.

Last February, after reading a newspaper report of the death in appalling poverty of the mother of an RAF pilot killed in the war, Mrs. Willis was so incensed that she attempted to daub paint on the Cenotaph in order to draw public attention to the plight of war pensioners. Her action may be considered rash, even foolish; but it must be seen in the context of the bitter resentment that an old lady has for the shabby treatment she and her kind have received over the years from ungrateful governments.



MRS. WILLIS
Disgraceful treatment

all." We also urge our readers to give what help they can to war pensioners in their own areas, and to do whatever they can to draw public attention to their sufferings.

ARRESTED

Although Mrs. Willis meant no disrespect to the War Dead, she was arrested and taken to Cannon Row Police Station, where she was charged. The next day at Bow Street Magistrates' Court Mrs. Willis was remanded on bail for one month so that social reports on her could be obtained. During the meantime she was taken ill and had to go to hospital. After her release from hospital she was too ill to attend the Court, so she wrote to inform it that she would be unable to attend the hearing.

At 7.30am (yes, 7.30am!) on the 17th of June at her Northampton home Mrs. Willis was arrested for failing to answer her bail and was put into a cell at Northampton Police Station. At 10pm that night she was taken to Cannon Row Police Station from where at 3am (!) next morning she was transported to Paddington Police Station. Four hours later she was taken to Bow Street Magistrates' Court where she received a prison sentence of three months, suspended for one year.

Although Mrs. Willis remains undaunted by her experiences and says that she will go on campaigning for a better deal for war pensioners so long as she has the strength, *New Frontier* considers it a national scandal that an old lady like Mrs. Willis should be subjected to treatment of the sort she received, and that she should be forced to go to the extremes that she did to obtain justice for a sadly neglected group of people who deserve better of our country.

New Frontier demands that the Government takes immediate action to alleviate the plight of these ageing people who "gave their

YOUR LETTERS

Sir,—What hypocrisy on the part of Mrs. Thatcher to make pious speeches against the suppression of the Polish people taking place on the orders of Poland's Soviet masters! Her Government is doing a regular trade with the Soviet Union and is now planning to increase this trade. She has refused, along with the heads of the other Common Market countries, to heed President Reagan's call for sanctions against the Soviets.

What a difference to the attitude of the EEC nations, including Britain, towards White Rhodesia, which harmed no-one and yet which was subjected to sanctions that eventually destroyed her!

R. L. BYRNE
Coventry

Sir,—A film is now showing in London called *Gallipoli*, which deals with the campaign of that name in World War I as seen through the eyes of Australian filmmakers.

Technically, the film has much to commend it. But it seems deliberately designed to fuel antagonism on the part of Australians toward Britain by reviving the hoary myth that ANZAC troops were carelessly sent to their deaths by British commanders because they were thought to be "expendable". This myth is one of the old favourites among those who seek to promote the anti-British movement in Australia.

There is now a wide consensus among military historians that the Gallipoli landings had much strategic merit but were bungled through tactical and administrative incompetence. This is an indictment of bad generalship, regardless of whether it was British or Australian, and whatever the quality of that generalship the very idea that it was likely to take risks with men's lives because they were Australians or New Zealanders whereas it would not have done had they been from the UK belongs to fantasy. Vastly greater number of British lives were sacrificed on the Western Front through the same ineptitude of the High Command.

P. GUTHRIE
London S.W.7

While Willie Whitelaw plans shorter jail sentences...

MUGGINGS REACH EPIDEMIC LEVEL

MUGGING IN BRITAIN is now reaching epidemic proportions. This is clear from new figures recently released by the Home Office. The figures also indicate a general increase in crime of all kinds.

In the third quarter of 1981, the latest period for which statistics are available, the number of serious crimes reported to the police were found to be 12 per-cent up on those for the same period of the previous year. A very large proportion of these consist of crimes of violence against the person, which are up by 5 per-cent. Cases of criminal damage are up 10 per-cent and burglaries are up 15 per-cent.

In one London borough, Lewisham, the number of muggings has increased by the staggering figure of 200 per-cent!

One of the latest victims of the Lewisham epidemic is 70-year-old Mrs. Elsie Shuttleworth, who is pictured on this page lying in hospital after her ordeal. Mrs. Shuttleworth was subjected to a vicious attack by a Black youth, who approached her from behind and knocked her violently to the ground before trying to take her bag. She was just one of 16 people who were attacked in the Lewisham area in the course of one weekend in December. According to police reports, all these attacks were carried out by Blacks. All but one of the victims were women and the majority were middle-aged or elderly.

Mrs. Shuttleworth's attack occurred at 5.30 in the late afternoon, which shows that muggers are getting increasingly confident that they can get away with their filthy business with plenty of people

about. She lost £35 in cash and some Xmas presents she had bought for her three grandchildren. According to her doctors, she was lucky to survive the attack.

Another victim was pensioner John McCleave, who lost his wallet containing all his Xmas money — £50. Another was Mrs. Anastasia White, who is 81. She had her feet kicked from under her by a young Black thug, who then stole her handbag. Now, she says, she will never walk out alone in the area again.

Said Chief Inspector Cressy of the local police: "We are doing everything possible to bring the culprits to justice. We have extra patrols out — but we cannot be everywhere."

RESPONSIBILITY WITH POLITICIANS

Inspector Cressy is of course right in saying that there are limits to what the police can do. The real responsibility for taking action to put an end to the mugging epidemic lies with our country's political leaders. In this regard there are two things they can do but refuse to do.

One is to make the penalties for such crimes far harsher — so harsh in fact that a mugger who has been caught and punished in the court will be terrified of ever getting caught and charged again. Jail sentences should be long and jail conditions exceedingly unpleasant, so that they provide a real deterrent to this loathsome type of crime.

But instead of this, Home Secretary Willie Whitelaw is seeking to reduce the length of jail sentences. His feeble excuse for this is that our



MRS. SHUTTLEWORTH
Viciously beaten and robbed by young Black.

jails are too crowded and he must take some steps to cut down the prison population!

And what of the Government's new detention centres where violent youths are now being sent in increasing numbers? Reports of these places show that, although the regime is somewhat tougher and more disciplined than an ordinary jail, it is not really unpleasant. Certainly, these centres are not providing adequate discouragement to young offenders to return to them,

for they have not had the slightest effect in reducing the types of crimes for which youngsters are sent there.

The other thing that the Government could do — and this is far more fundamental — is remove from Britain's shores those elements of the population from which the great majority of muggers are recruited. All statistics show that mugging is a crime made epidemic in this country by Blacks, and it is no accident that the areas where muggings are most rife are in the main part areas with the highest concentrations of Black immigrants and their offspring — Lewisham being just one example.

New Frontier believes that all Blacks and other non-Europeans should eventually be repatriated

from Britain. However, the Government could make a start by repatriating the specific Blacks found guilty of mugging and other serious crimes. If the Blacks in question are still wards of their families, then the families too should be repatriated.

But because of wet government — wet in its approach to crime and punishment and wet in its attitude to racial aliens in Britain — old folk like Mrs. Shuttleworth and Mrs. White cannot walk the streets of this country without fear — not only late at night but now in the daytime. It is a scandal and a disgrace for which, one day, someone will pay.

TALKING POINTS

by FRONTIERSMAN

STRASBOURG LAW

Few Britons would be likely to lose much sleep if the so-called European Court of Human Rights were to disappear from the face of the earth tomorrow. The Court, which holds sway in Strasbourg, seemingly spends its time telling other people how they should conduct their affairs. Fortunately, it has no jurisdiction here; it can cajole, entreat or even condemn, but it cannot (yet) enforce our compliance. Luckily for us all, the Court has no real teeth; but endeavours are being made to confer upon it all the powers and authority of our own British Courts. Recent cases brought before the Court and judgments pronounced by it have reinforced my long-held opinion that this meddling institution is something we could very well do without.

No person of any sense will agree with the shameful treatment that was meted out to the three British Rail workers who were summarily dismissed from their jobs without compensation for their refusal to join a trade union as required by the Labour Government's closed shop legislation of 1975. The railwaymen were treated most unjustly, but we don't need foreigners to tell us this; it was a matter for the British Parliament to put to rights, not Strasbourg. It is perhaps of passing interest, if somewhat ironic, that the railwaymen's case was submitted to Strasbourg by the Freedom Association — an organisation which evidently imagines that the freedom of Britons can best be guaranteed by surrendering British jurisprudence to the tender mercies of Continental jurists!

More recently, my detestation of the European Court has been increased by a number of judgements emanating from Strasbourg, which defy common sense, justice and even human decency. When the Court presumes to discuss the methods used to punish erring children in British schools, and then has the effrontery to tell us that caning, a time-proven deterrent understood by all British schoolboys, is a "humiliating form of institutional violence" and an "assault on the integrity of children" my hackles begin to rise. When it warns us that to birch a young thug for committing an act of violence on the Isle of Man would be a "degrading punishment contrary to the European Human Rights Convention" my hackles rise even

further. But when the Court has the audacity to accuse the British Government of "violating human rights" by its failure to repeal laws forbidding homosexual acts in Ulster, I seriously begin contemplating the desirability of emigrating — preferably to Ulster or the Isle of Man.

ELECTORAL LIABILITY

As he is a Tribune, Mr. Michael Foot's refusal to endorse Mr. Peter Tatchell as Labour's prospective parliamentary candidate for Bermondsey seems odd; especially since Mr. Tatchell's views are almost identical to those advanced by Mr. Foot himself, and when we remember Mr. Foot's long record as an 'extra-parliamentary' rabble rouser — the very crime of which Mr. Tatchell stands condemned. Why, then, has Mr. Foot declared the hapless young bachelor persona non grata? Prior to his emergence as a prospective candidate, Mr. Tatchell



PETER TATCHELL
What do you think?

was best known for his vociferous support for the Gay Liberation Front. So could it be that Labour's Leader, who according to Chapman Pincher was responsible for the award of a peerage to the notoriously homosexual Tom

Driberg, has belatedly realised that British voters are so heartily sick of queers that anyone who champions their perverted cause is an electoral liability?

ROGUSH SYMPATHIES

Although I have scant respect for those who by their behaviour have succeeded in destroying the National Front and bring British Nationalism into disrepute, I do take umbrage when that party of which I was so long a member, and to which some of my more misguided friends still cling, is unfairly maligned by the media. Listening to the radio news the other evening, I heard the announcer say that a National Front "sympathiser" had been sentenced to life imprisonment for murder, arson and acts of violence against coloured people. Quite obviously this criminal madman wasn't a member of the NF; otherwise we may be sure that the media would have had a field day emphasising that very point!

It stands to reason that a lot of criminals sympathise with one or other of the political parties without actually being members, but that doesn't make those parties responsible for their crimes. For all I know, the Yorkshire Ripper may be an ardent supporter of the SDP, but even that would in no way make the SDP any worse than it already is. In any case, judging by the high number of MPs and local councillors who are convicted every year on a variety of serious charges, the Establishment parties are not without their share of rogues, but this is played down by the media.

And talking of rogues reminds me that just recently an eminent surgeon, one Paul Vickers, who is a member of the Conservative party and a member of the European Movement, was sentenced to life imprisonment for poisoning his sick wife to death in order that he would be free to marry one of his mistresses. But next day's headlines didn't read: "PRO-EUROPEAN TORY GETS LIFE FOR WIFE MURDER." Why not?

WELL SAID!


One of the local papers in my area recently published a letter from no less a personage than Dr. Jacob Gewirtz of the Board of Deputies of British Jews. He was complaining because the paper has been in the habit of publishing letters from people who he regards as "Nazis." It is worth reproducing the Editor's reply which appeared beneath Dr. Gewirtz's letter:

"A foundation of British democracy is the right of individuals to free speech. Once a newspaper, for example, starts to censor a person's views because it finds them offensive, the erosion of that freedom begins."

Well said! It's a pity that some of the national papers don't heed that advice.

COMMON MARKET COMMENT

'CIVILISING' THE JUGGERNAUT



THE SIGHT of so many lorries helplessly stranded in the snow and impeding the flow of other traffic along our roads during the recent cold spell should convince even the most ardent pro-Marketeer how foolish it would be for Britain to comply with EEC regulations by raising the permitted maximum weight of goods vehicles.

Common sense dictates that a much greater proportion of goods should be transported by railway or by our neglected inland waterways, and that only smaller, lighter and more manoeuvrable lorries should be allowed on the roads so as to keep them free to enable people to go about their everyday business with as little hindrance and discomfort as possible. But that is not to be if the Government has its way; for in deference to the wishes of the Euro-bureaucrats, the Transport Secretary, Mr. Howell, has presented a White Paper to Parliament proposing that the top weight for lorries be raised from 32½ to 40 tonnes — an increase of more than 23 per cent!

According to Mr. Howell, increasing the permitted weight of lorries will mean that there will be approximately 10,000 fewer of them on the roads. Perhaps; but it

will also mean at least 10,000 fewer jobs, more noise, more fumes, and more wear and tear on people, buildings and the roads themselves.

Speaking in the Commons, Mr. Howell said that his proposals were "a move in the right direction towards civilising the lorry." Who does he think he's kidding? Juggernauts can't be "civilised" by increasing their weight. On the contrary, heavier lorries will further erode the quality of life of many of our citizens as well as putting the environment in which we live, and on which we all depend, in even greater peril.

Mr. Howell's remarks in the Commons and the contents of the White Paper are so much gobble-dyhook. The fact is that the proposals are not half so much concerned with "civilising the lorry" as with maximising profits for the few, which is, indeed, the EEC's sole *raison d'être*.

This is a matter about which everyone seriously concerned with the well-being of our people and our environment must make a stand. Readers of this column are urged to let their MPs and other people of influence know their views in no uncertain terms!

New year's message to NNF

Dear Colleagues,

As we enter a New Year, I should like to extend my best wishes to all officers of the party and, through them, to the members of the party. I should also like to express my thanks for all the hard work and sacrifice that everyone has put in during the year of 1981, just ended.

1981 has not been an easy year for any of us — our own party or any of the other parties in the camp of British Nationalism. We have had to cope with adverse political conditions, dominated by the rise of the Social Democratic Party and the hope among many of our fellow citizens — futile though that hope is — that this new phenomenon represents the force for change and renewal that Britain has been waiting for. Until the SDP bubble is burst, as burst it will be, the message of nationalism is likely to fall on many unreceptive ears and recruitment to our cause is going to be all the harder.

Our other difficulties have been created by our divisions — the divisions among fellow nationalists that are absurd and self-defeating considering the many things that bind us in common belief. While we have sought throughout this last year to breach these divisions at every opportunity, others have worked with equal intensity to keep them open. In this situation we have had no alter-

native but to persist with the task of building the New National Front, though this task must of necessity be accomplished largely at the cost of seeking to diminish the membership of other nationalist organisations in order to expand our own. Our ideal is a united nationalist movement in which no one faction is forced to seek its own growth at the expense of another. Until this ideal is achieved, however, we have to accept the fact of inter-factional rivalry and work to ensure that we ourselves emerge victorious from it.

In 1981 we have made considerable strides towards this objective, although there is still no little way to go. During the year we won over many branches and groups of the old National Front and a few also from other factions, including the NCFM, British Movement and the British Democratic Party. In the meantime no branch or group defected from the New NF to any of the other factions. This indicates that the balance of advantage is moving inexorably in our favour. We have only to sustain this effort and victory will be assured.


That, however, will be only the prelude to the pursuit of the other, much more important victory: that of the united forces of nationalism over those of internationalism.

In the New National Front we have succeeded in building an organisation that is internally sound, well disciplined, undivided by factions and internal bickering, and comprised of members and officers of what I believe to be a higher average quality than those of other nationalist groups. On top of this, we are financially solvent in the sense that we can meet our routine bills. We need, on the other hand, to raise much more money in order to exploit the potential that we have for expansion.

In 1982, as in 1981, we shall lose no opportunity to bring nationalists in Britain together in unity; nor shall we fail to support the initiatives of others taken to that purpose — providing that we can be convinced that they are sincere and realistically conceived. At the same time we shall not allow the pursuit of the ideal of unity to lessen our commitment to building up the strength of our own organisation, the New National Front. The whole of anything is as good and as powerful as the sum total of its parts.

I believe that there are some signs

by JOHN TYNDALL



that British Nationalists as a whole have a greater will to unity as we begin 1982 than was the case at the outset of 1981.

Many have taken it rather easy around the Xmas period, availing themselves of the opportunity for a rest and a recharging of batteries that is seldom in the offing at other times of the year. This is all to the good and I hope that everyone has enjoyed themselves.

Now, however, is the time to renew the fight with ever greater vigour and to make fresh resolutions with the coming of the New Year to conquer new fields. There is a lot to do in the coming months. Let us continue to work hard together and it can be done!

JOHN TYNDALL

THE WORDS THAT SAY IT ALL

"He (Andrew Fountaine) said... he would like to rejoin the Conservative Party..."

JEWISH CHRONICLE

TRAITORS

(Contd. from page 2)

the names of many more traitors who are hiding behind the libel laws, some still holding important posts, as soon as he is able to substantiate evidence already in his possession.

In view of these disquieting development, *New Frontier* demands that the following questions be promptly answered if the Government wishes to avoid the accusation that it has been involved in a cover-up:—

- Why did the Government turn down demands that there be a security inquiry into the activities of the Blunt spy ring?
- Why was Blunt allowed to continue working as a trusted member of the Royal Household long after his activities as a spy had been discovered?
- Why was Mr. Leo Long given assurances that he would not be prosecuted for treason despite the fact that he refuses to name other spies with whom he was involved over the years? And why did Mrs. Thatcher announce in the Commons that no action would be taken against this traitor?
- Why was Mr. Scott told that although he would not be given immunity from prosecution, it was unlikely that any charges would be made against him?

- Why in view of their admitted guilt are Long and Scott in receipt of State pensions?
- Why have official documents relating to security operations up to 1964 disappeared when the law requires that such documents should be made available for public scrutiny after 30 years?

SOMETHING TO HIDE?

The Government's reluctance to initiate proceedings against the likes of Blunt, Long and Scott, together with the mysterious 'disappearance' of official documents — an increasingly frequent occurrence these days — must lead most thinking people to conclude that when it comes to 'Top People' any crime, however dastardly, is permissible; or that the Government itself has something to hide.

Once again *New Frontier* demands that the rot which is evidently so prevalent in the upper echelons of our society must be fully exposed. In the interests of our national security an inquiry must be held under the supervision of a patriot whose loyalty to Crown and Country is beyond dispute. Furthermore, we demand that all promises of immunity from prosecution (which are in themselves illegal) be revoked, and that any persons found guilty of treason by a jury get their just deserts.

To Thatcher

*With guile and persuasion
And artful evasion
And use of the carrot and stick,
That dread Mrs. Thatcher
(There's no one can match her)
Performs yet another con trick:
With callous effrontery
She's making our country
Ill, if not mortally sick!*

"The influx of black and brown populations into Britain is the equivalent to the entry of 35 million whites into India."

— Editorial comment in THE DAILY TELEGRAPH

GLUM PROSPECT 1982

(Contd. from front page)

blame was put, not on the wild animals who burned and looted premises and threw bombs at our police, but on White British society for not welcoming them sufficiently into its bosom and giving them the schooling and jobs that are supposed to be theirs by some kind of divine right. While thousands were unemployed in Tyneside, Clydeside and the Rhondda Valley and were still obeying the law, we were expected to engage in a great nationwide sobbing orgy over those who were unemployed in Brixton, Moss Side and Toxteth and took the law into their own hands.

So Britain, by reason of the vapid and cowardice of her administrators, faces in 1982 the prospect of a similar spate of anarchy and lawlessness as she experienced in 1981. The appetite of the mobsters has been whetted by the rich plums they were awarded for their last effort; they will be back again with another effort. They realise that in place of national leaders Britain faces them with a collection of petrified hens. They are rightly contemptuous, and they will show their contempt.

So it is also with the bombers and the gunmen in Northern Ireland. While Westminster, in whatever party clothing, continues to negotiate towards the achievement of their dream of an all-Irish republic, they face, if caught, no worse a fate than a spell of ease and comfort in

TIME TO RENEW!

We have been asked by New National Front Head Office to remind all readers who are also NNF members to renew their subscriptions for 1982 as soon as possible.

Subscriptions are at the same rate as for last year, i.e. £6 for full members and £3 for associate members, with a 50 per-cent reduction in the full member rate available for OAPs and students.

The Maze — termed a 'prison' but in fact the United Kingdom's largest and most expensive rest home. With such incentives, they can be relied upon to sustain their campaign of terror in the coming year just as they did in the last.

NO CHANGE

In 1981 none of the drastic reforms needed to save Britain from collapse were even contemplated, let alone adopted, by any of the established politicians or parties. Nor will they be in the year just beginning. Those who have grown fat and prosperous on the system will not want to change the system. Only from outside the system, and in the persons of new men and women up to now little known or heard of, will the necessary changes come.

They will come by means of the growing nationalist movement in Britain which, though presently hindered by division, represents the only real force of renewal in this country. If the splits that now weaken this movement can be overcome in 1982, its true potential may come to flower, not by immediate political success this year — it is too early for that — but by the establishment of a rallying point around which can gather all those Britons who want to work for a national resurgence in the future.

This is the one bright prospect that we may hope for in 1982. It will not be a year in which national fortunes will change, except for the worse. But it can be a year in which the seeds of later national salvation can be firmly sown. It is up to us.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

- The return of leadership and statesmanship to British affairs.
- A government that will put British interests first.
- British withdrawal from the European Common Market.
- Closer links with the White Commonwealth.
- Protection of British industry by the exclusion of foreign manufactured goods from Britain.
- A sane financial system which will give to the people the purchasing power to buy the goods they produce.
- The revival of British farming.
- British ownership and control of British industry and resources.
- A clamp-down on social security spongers and the restoration of the incentive to work.
- An end to immigration and a start to repatriation.
- British support of the Whites in South Africa.
- An end to financial aid to black dictatorships.
- The strengthening of Britain's defences.
- Tougher treatment of criminals.
- The banning of the IRA, the death penalty for terrorists and firm support of the Loyalist majority in Northern Ireland.
- Repeal of the laws permitting Abortion and Homosexuality and a general toughening up of legislation against the promotion of obscenity in the media.
- The elimination of Communism in Britain, in the mass media, in the factory and in the schoolroom.

WRITE TO US

To: New National Front, PO Box 115, Hove, East Sussex BN3 3SB.
Tick appropriate box

Please send me more information about the New National Front for which I enclose 20p. ☐

I wish to become a Full Member of the New National Front and enclose £6.00 (Half-rate for students and OAPs) ☐

I wish to become an Associate Member of the New National Front and enclose £3.00. (No half-rate) ☐

Name

Address

Tapes for your library

NNF Recordings offer the following two cassettes dealing with topics of interest to nationalists:

VOICES OF NATIONALISM

Side 1: Extracts of speeches from the New National Front rally in London on September 5th 1981 on the theme 'Whites unite or go under!' Speakers include Len Beardsford Walker, Kenneth McKilliam, Ray Hill (guest speaker), Derek Merry and NNF Chairman John Tyndall. A substantial part of John Tyndall's closing speech is recorded.

Side 2: Talk by John Tyndall on the theme 'The coming British revolution'. In this talk Mr. Tyndall exposes the fraudulence of the system known as 'democracy' and outlines the vital political changes needed in Britain to bring about national recovery.

TYNDALL SPEAKS

Side 1: Talk by John Tyndall on the theme 'Our Anglo-Saxon heritage'. In this talk Mr. Tyndall speaks of the world-wide dispersion of the peoples of British stock and the necessity for them to unite to guarantee their survival against the threat of the non-White races.

Side 2: Talk by John Tyndall on the theme 'Britain's economic crisis'. In this talk Mr. Tyndall attacks the policies that have made 3 million people in Britain unemployed and outlines the nationalist programme for the achievement of full employment.

These are both 90-minute cassettes and cost £3 each with 15p each added to cover postage. They can be ordered from NNF Recordings, Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.

New Frontier, though it believes in racial differences, opposes race-hatred. All those who oppose multi-racialism should attack the politicians who promote it, not the immigrants, who are merely its victims.

Read

SPEARHEAD

For an in-depth view of Nationalist policies read *Spearhead*, a 20 page monthly magazine which supports the New National Front. Price 35p. Annual subscription £6.00. 47p for sample copy to: *Spearhead*, PO Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.

BUY NEW FRONTIER IN BULK

New Frontier retails at 12p from your local seller. Would bulk purchasers please order only in the quantities listed below. Standing orders welcomed.

10 copies £1.20 + 30p post
25 copies £2.70 + 87p post
50 copies £4.80 + £1.43 post
100 copies £8.40 + £1.73 post
150 copies £11.70 + £1.90 post
200 copies £14.40 + £2.05 post
300 copies £19.80 + £2.35 post
400 copies £24.00 + £2.55 post
500 copies £29.40) Bulk rates
1,000 copies £55.20) by roaline

Cheques/postal orders to *New Frontier*, PO Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB. Please keep orders and enquiries concerning *New Frontier* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

SUBSCRIBE!

In order to make sure of receiving *New Frontier* regularly, why not take out a subscription? The rate is £3.40 for 12 issues for subscribers in the British Isles. For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail). Please make cheques/POs payable to *New Frontier* and send to *New Frontier*, PO Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.

An additional charge of £1.00 is required on all foreign cheques.

Name

Address

OVERSEAS SUBSCRIBERS WELCOMED